

Summary of Competition Process for EJ CPS
Region 6

TITLE ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COLLABORATIVE PROBLEM-SOLVING COOPERATIVE
AGREEMENT PROGRAM

TYPE INITIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

FUNDING NO. EPA-OECA-OEJ-06-03

CFDA NO. 66.306

ANNOUNCEMENT DATE June 15, 2006

CLOSING DATE October 16, 2006

Type of Project Solicited. The EJ CPS program requires selected applicants, or recipients, to use the Environmental Justice Collaborative Problem-Solving Model (EJ CPS Model) as part of their projects. The purpose of the EJ CPS Model is to assist affected communities so that they can develop proactive, strategic, and visionary approaches to address their environmental justice issues and to achieve community health and sustainability. The EJ CPS program is designed for multi-statute environmental and/or public health issues. Therefore, each project must include activities that are authorized by two or more of the following federal environmental statutes:

- o Clean Water Act, Section 104(b) (3)
- o Safe Drinking Water Act, Section 1442(c)(3)(C)
- o Solid Waste Disposal Act, Section 8001(a)
- o Clean Air Act, Section 103(b) (3)
- o Toxic Substances Control Act, Section 10(a)
- o Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, Section 20(a)
- o Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act, Section 203

Breakdown of the number of applications

of applicants that applied in total 42

of applicants ineligible in total 2

of applicant eligible in total 40

of applicants from Region 6 5

of eligible applicants from Region 6, 4

Review Process

All applications will be reviewed and scored under a two-step process.

Threshold Screening Process. All applications will be screened in Headquarters (HQ) to ensure that the application meets the conditions of Threshold Eligibility Criteria (see Section III: B and V

A. 1) The screeners will rely on the One-page Threshold Eligibility Form in conducting their review.

Panel Review Process. All applications that make it through the Threshold Screening Process will be distributed to the EPA region with responsibility for the state in which the project is located. For a listing of EPA's ten regions and the state for which they are responsible, go to Section VII. Each Region will designate three regional reviewers to review the applications. OEJ will designate three HQ reviewers to sit on all ten panels, evaluating the applications for all of the Regions. Therefore, a panel of six reviewers will review, score, and rank the applications for each Region. The rank list from each Region will be sent to the OEJ Selection Official for final selection.

The Criteria that Proposals Were Evaluated Against

Criterion	Maximum Points per Criterion
<p>Past Performance in Reporting on Outputs and Outcomes. You will be evaluated on how well you have demonstrated prior experience in reporting outputs and outcomes. This will be determined through your description of how you have documented and/or reported on progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under prior and/or current assistance agreements, and if you did not make such progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes, whether the documentation and/or reports satisfactorily explain why not. In evaluating this criterion, the Agency will consider the information you supplied in the proposal, and may also consider relevant information from other sources including Agency files and prior/current grantors. If you do not have prior experience reporting outputs and outcomes, you will receive a neutral score of 2 points for this criterion.</p>	5 points total
<p>Community and Environmental and/or Public Health Information. You will be evaluated on your ability to clearly describe the local environmental and/or public health issue you propose to address and the community that is impacted. This will be determined through your description of the following areas:</p> <p>Group One -- 5 points for (1) -- (2) the local environmental and/or public health issue that you seek to address; the local environmental and/or public health results your project seeks to achieve;</p> <p>Group Two -- 10 points for (3) -- (5) the affected community that you work directly with, or provide services to; how the affected community is disproportionately impacted by environmental harms and risks; and how the affected community will benefit from your project's intended local environmental and/or public health results.</p> <p>You must include relevant information, such as demographics, geographic location, maps, community history, and community assets.</p>	15 points total

<p>Organization's Historical Connection to Affected Community. You will be evaluated on your ability to demonstrate a strong connection between your organization and the affected community. In scoring this section, Reviewers will consider the strength of the organization's historical involvement with the affected community and the on-going communications between you and the affected community residents and/or organizations. In addition, Reviewers will consider the extent of the affected community's active participation in the project and in the decision-making process. This will be determined through your description of the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> history of your organization's involvement with the affected community, including duration of involvement and circumstances that led to your involvement how you have worked with the affected community's residents and/or organizations to address local environmental and/or public health issues, how the affected community's residents and/or organizations have been part of the decision-making process, how your efforts have led to increased capacity on the part of the affected community to address local environmental and/or public health issues; and how you maintain and sustain an ongoing relationship with the affected community's residents and/or organizations 	<p>26 points total</p> <p>4 points each for items (1)-(5)</p>
<p>Organizational Capacity and Programmatic Capability. You will be evaluated on your ability to demonstrate how your organization has the organizational capacity and programmatic capability to undertake this project. In evaluating your organization for programmatic capability purposes under this criterion, OEJ will consider information provided by you and may consider information from other sources, including Agency files. Applicants who have no relevant or available past performance reporting will receive a neutral score for this factor. A neutral score in this case is 2 points.</p>	<p>5 points total</p>
<p>Project Description. Reviewers will consider how thoroughly and clearly you address each section and will consider how realistic your project description is in addressing the identified local environmental and/or public health issue. The Reviewers will give more consideration to a write-up that is focused and succinct and one that does not address too many issues. You will be evaluated on the clarity of your write-up in addressing the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group One - 10 points for items (1) - (3) Issue Identification, Visioning, and Strategic Goal-Setting, Community Capacity-Building and Leadership Development, Development of Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships and Leveraging of Resources. Group Two - 10 points for items (4) - (5) Consensus Building and Dispute Resolution, Development of Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships and Leveraging of Resources. Group Three - 10 points for items (6) - (7) Sound Management and Implementation, and Evaluation. 	<p>30 points total</p>
<p>Qualifications of Principal Investigator/Project Manager. You will be evaluated on your ability to clearly demonstrate that the PI/PM selected to lead this project is the most qualified. This will be determined through your description of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> why the PI/PM is qualified to undertake the project how the PI/PM has ties to the community, and past activities that the PI/PM has worked on with the community. 	<p>5 points total</p>
<p>Activity Timeline. You will be evaluated on your ability to identify specific implementation target dates for all of the proposed activities in your project.</p>	<p>5 points total</p>

Detailed Budget. You will be evaluated on the reasonableness of the costs and how the budget relates to the activities under the project. You will receive a score of "zero" for this criterion if you include costs that are restricted under Section IV E "Funding Restrictions".	5 points total
Project Performance Measures. You will be evaluated on your ability to formulate clearly thought out project performance measures and how effective these performance measures will be in tracking the local environmental and/or public health results using output and outcome measures.	10 points total
This will be determined through your description of (1) baseline information; and (2) Project Performance Measures.	5 points each for items (1)-(2)
Total Maximum Points Available	100

Ranking of applications

Region 6

(1)	72.0	Louisiana Environmental Justice Community Organization Coalition
(2)	69.0	Mary Queen of Vietnam CDC
(3)	53.0	Holy Cross Neighborhood Association
(4)	43.0	Silas H. Hunt CDC
(5)	0.0	Merrick Jessie Clay

Region 6 - LEJCOC

The Clean Air Act Section 103(b)(3) authorizes the Administrator of EPA to make grants to air pollution control agencies, to other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and to individuals to conduct, and promote the coordination and acceleration of, research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects (including health and welfare effects), extent, prevention, and control of air pollution. In addition, the Toxic Substances Control Act Section 10(a) authorizes the Administrator to make grants for research, development, monitoring, public education, training, demonstrations, and studies. The recipient, LEJCOC is a nonprofit organization that will conduct studies on the state of air quality in two local communities of Louisiana consistent with CAA 103(b)(3) and TSCA 10(a). This information will be disseminated to local residents and used to educate and train them on the use of Alternative Dispute Resolution and Pollution Prevention so that they can work with industry to reduce their exposure to toxic air contaminants. The project relates to the Clean Air Act and the Toxic Substances and Control Act because the activities will lead to a reduction in toxic exposure of residents from the various industries in the two communities. The residents are concerned about their exposure to toxic air emissions from some of the industries. The recipient will train residents on the use of Alternative Dispute Resolution and Pollution Prevention, which will equip residents to work directly with industries that are releasing toxic air pollutants to either: (1) come into compliance with permits; (2) meet emission levels lower than the permit levels; and/or (3) institute non-permit initiatives to reduce resident exposure to toxic air pollutants.